Liddell Hart: Can Suicide Deter? P. 2

Exclusive: First Text of the Declaration by the German Atomic Scientists, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 17 APRIL 29, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Shall It Be Reverence for Life, or A Final Gamble With Death?

The Question Every Nuclear Physicist Must Face

The central point at the Nuremberg trials was that no man, soldier or civilian, could absolve himself from guilt for crime on the plea that he was obeying orders of a superior. The question now is whether the world scientific community will continue to work on the perfection of methods for slaughter which may extinguish human life on this planet. This is what every scientist must face up to in his own conscience. The answer he gives will determine whether he is a man, in the full sense of the word, responsible as a man should be for the fate of other men, or a tool.

One section of the world scientific community has given an answer. The declaration of the 18 German atomic scientists that they will take no part in the production, testing or utilization of nuclear weapons is an event of magnitude in the realm of history and morals. The scientists of Germany, who know from bitter shame what it means to have collaborated in mass murder on orders of the State, are the first to answer "no" to the process which would turn the earth itself into a vast crematorium. If there is no echoing answer from America and Russia, from Britain and France, the world war against Fascism will seem in the eyes of German youth a lie. For the best minds of East and West will seem to be marching past them, too, in goose-step, weakly absolving themselves of responsibility, shrugging their shoulders, with the old feeble Germanic excuse, *"Ich bin nur ein kleine Mensch."* The greatest minds of our generation will indeed seem little men.

No Such Thing As "Baby" Bombs

Dr. Albert Schweitzer, from deepest Africa, has added his noble voice, appealing as did Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein with nine other scientists two years ago for an end of preparation for nuclear war. But the Germans, among them one German Jew, Max Born, who returned to Germany, have done more than make an appeal. They have set an example. The text of their declaration, which no paper in the U. S. has yet printed (a fact itself significant), is important in that it answers the nonsense being spread by military propaganda that small, tactical, "baby" bombs can somehow safely be used. They point out that these baby bombs are the equivalent in firepower of the bomb which fell on Hiroshima, no harmless military toy. The declaration deserves to be widely circulated, if only to combat the delusion that tactical atomic weapons are somehow safe, and have effects which can be limited to the immediate battlefield.

The declaration itself is part of a chain reaction set off by the new British White Paper. If Britain must have the H-bomb and place primary reliance for defense upon its possession, then so must Germany and if Germany, then France; and if France, then Italy; and if Italy, then Israel; and if Israel, then Egypt. . . . When every power, great or small, can brandish these ultimate weapons, the chances of setting off the ultimate conflagration will be increased many-fold. The Bonn *General Anzeiger* of April 13 wondered why the German scientists should suddenly have pledged themselves not to take part in the production of nuclear weapons, since the Paris treaties for German rearmament forbid their production in the Reich. There is speculation in the German press that the German scientists spoke up because tacitly the Western powers have already agreed that this restriction will be waived. Imagine what Hitler would have done if he had this weapon, imagine what a new Hitler would do with it, and one can understand why the German scientists at the first hint of this decided to speak. We honor them for doing so.

Men Into Automatons

"The man who becomes a victim of propaganda is no longer human, he does not live a life of his own . . . normally we ascribe this method of making man basically inhuman to what we call totalitarianism — to Nazis and to Bolsheviks. But 'cold war' is the same everywhere and uses the same methods. Man must not think. He must do what he is ordered to do. . . . The consequences of 'cold war' are the same everywhere: suspicion, enmity, mistrust, hatred . . . the 'cold war' destroys the spiritual basis of human life. There is nothing good in your neighbor on the other side of the fence or borderline. . . . And so you accept it, unwittingly at first, then at last with full 'conviction,' as you think. But you don't think, you only believe what you think, because propaganda tells you what you think. . . . Human beings are being turned into automatons."

—Pastor Martin Niemoller, Friends House, London, March 26 (Text in Peace News, April 5).

No Leadership in Britain

The texts of the British White Paper on defense and of the debate upon it in the House of Commons now available almost make one despair. To read the White Paper and then to see it described by as sober a publication as the London *Economist* as "logical and realistic" makes one wonder whether mankind is slowly, logically and realistically growing quite irrational. The White Paper "frankly" recognizes that there is no defense against a nuclear attack and concludes quite rightly therefore "that the overriding consideration in all military planning must be to prevent war rather than to prepare for it." But it then turns around and proposes to make England's defense totally dependent on weapons which (as Liddell Hart

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exclusive: In the Full Text, Not Hitherto Published in This Country

Germany's 18 Leading Atomic Scientists Refuse to Work on Nuclear Weapons

Because no paper in this country so far as we know, not even the New York Times, *has published the text of the historic declaration made by Germany's leading atomic scientists, we obtained the text from the* Sud-deutsche Zeitung *of April 13-14.*

"The plan for the atomic arming of the Bundeswehr fill the undersigned atomic scientists with deep sorrow. Some of them indicated their misgivings several months ago to the responsible Minister. Now the question is being generally debated. The undersigned therefore feel themselves obliged to call attention publicly to certain facts the experts know but of which the public does not yet seem sufficiently informed:

"1. Tactical atomic weapons have the same destructive power as normal atomic bombs. They are described as tactical in order to express the idea that they are to be used not only against human settlements but against ground troops. Every single tactical atom bomb or shell has an effect similar to that of the first atom bomb, which destroyed Hiroshima. Because the tactical atom bombs are available today in great numbers, their total destructive effect would be much greater. These bombs are called 'small' only in comparison with the 'strategic' bombs developed since, above all the hydrogen bomb.

"2. No physical limits are known to the possibility of increasing the destructive effects of strategic atomic weapons. Today one tactical atom bomb can destroy a small city. But one hydrogen bomb can render a region as big as the Ruhr uninhabitable for some time. Through the diffusion of radioactivity, one could today with hydrogen bombs in all likelihood destroy the population of the West German Republic. We know no possible technique for protecting large masses of population from this peril.

"We know how difficult it is to draw political conclusions from these facts. Some will try to deny us the right to do so, since we are not engaged in politics. But our profession, which is devoted to pure science and its development and through which we influence many younger men, imposes on us responsibility for the possible consequences. On this account these are political questions on which we cannot keep silent.

"We recognize that the Western world today is defending freedom against Communism. We do not deny that mutual fear of hydrogen bombs makes a vital contribution to the preservation of peace in the world and of freedom in part of it. We believe however that reliance for long on this way of securing peace and freedom is treacherous (unzuverlassig) and we believe the peril, in case it fails, is deadly.

"We feel no competence to make concrete proposals for the political consideration of the great powers. We believe, however, that a small country like the West German Republic best protects itself and promotes world peace if it expressly and freely renounces possession of atomic weapons of every kind. In any event none of the undersigned are ready to take any part in any way in the manufacture, testing or use of atomic weapons.

"At the same time we emphasize that it is extremely important to advance the peaceful application of atomic energy by all means and we will cooperate in this task as heretofore."

(Signed), Professors Fritz Bopp, Max Born, Rudolf Fleischmann, Walther Gerlach, Otto Hahn, Otto Haxel, Werner Heisenberg, Hans Kopfermann, Max von Laue, Heinz Maier-Leibnitz, Josef Mattauch, Friedrich-Adolf Paneth, Wolfgang Paul, Wolfgang Riezler, Fritz Strassmann, Wilhelm Walcher, Carl Friedrich von Weizsacker and Karl Wirtz.

What Progress, Dr. Adenauer?

"Apparently the authors of this declaration [the atomic scientists] . . . have not been informed of the progress which has been made in the United States with regard to the protection of the civil population and soldiers from these weapons.' . . . Adenauer regretted that the Professors had not spoken with him before giving out their declaration."

—Suddeutsche Zeitung (Munich) April 13-14.

Mr. [Val] Peterson [Federal Civil Defense Administrator]. "We must not make the American people believe that simply by its government spending billions that we can save the people in cities. It is just an impossibility. . . . There isn't going to be any security in a thermonuclear war. That is the blunt fact. . . . No one is prepared for this kind of war."

—Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on the 1958 budget.

"It must be frankly recognized that there is at present no means of providing adequate protection for the people of this country against the consequences of an attack with nuclear weapons."

—The New British White Paper on Defense.

Famous British Military Expert Calls "Nuclear Defense" Merely A Form of Suicide

"The basis of Europe's defense situation and problem, can be summed up thus:

"The present plan of using nuclear weapons both 'tactically' and 'strategically' makes sense as a deterrent, but not as a defense—for put into use it means suicide.

"The original plan of Supreme HQ, Allied Powers, Europe, was to build up forces strong enough to check aggression with normal weapons. That plan made sense as a way of defense without nuclear suicide.

"The revised SHAPE plan of defense, with tactical atomic weapons to compensate the reduced scale of its forces, would make sense if such action is practicable without wider strategic use of nuclear weapons.

"But the combination of the two does not appear to make sense—and it rests with SHAPE to show how it can. Their case has not been at all convincing so far.

"All the statements they have made in the past few years about their planning has left the impression that they consider it impossible to draw a line between tactical and strategical action with such weapons, and see no hope of stopping short of all-out war. Such a view naturally discourages the peoples of Europe. . . . For what is the sense of pouring out money on forms of defense that merely make suicide more certain?" . . .

—B. H. Liddell Hart, letter to the London Times, Mar. 26.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Marcus Singer Case Is Like That of Watkins But With the 5th Amendment Added

A Newly Split Legal Hair to Protect Against the Ignominy of Informing

There must be many intellectuals who had the experience in the 30's or 40's of belonging to Marxist study groups under Communist influence. For them the Marcus Singer contempt case, just decided here 2-to-1 by the Court of Appeals, will be of special interest. It involves a finely split legal hair which, if it wins favor with a majority of the Supreme Court, may save them from the necessity of going to jail for contempt if they do not wish to suffer the ignominy of informing on others.

Dr. Singer, a professor of zoology at Cornell, four years ago admitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities that he belonged to a Marxist study group at Harvard in the early 40's but declined on grounds of honor, conscience and the Fifth amendment to name others. Honor and conscience have no standing in our courts, but his attorneys worked out an ingenious defense for him under the Fifth amendment.*

A man who admits to membership in the Communist party cannot under the *Rogers* case (340 U. S. 367) refuse to name others on Fifth amendment grounds. The Supreme Court there held that once membership was admitted, naming others did not increase the danger of self-incrimination. But Dr. Singer's lawyers pleaded that while he considered himself a Communist there was no evidence that he had actually been a member of the party. He testified that he took part in no illegal activities.

The defense pointed out that, according to the testimony of the "cooperative" witness, Robert Gorham Davis, the Marxist study groups to which Dr. Singer belonged were so loosely organized that not only some of their members but even some of the instructors "were not actually party members."

Nine He Would Not Identify

Dr. Singer was cited for contempt in refusing to identify nine persons (including Davis) named to him by the Committee as having attended his study group. These nine were identified by other witnesses as "hard core" Communists. The defense pleaded that if he had identified these "real" Communists as members of his study group, he might have put that study group in a quite different light and incriminated himself under the Smith act, which makes it a crime to belong to any "group" which advocates or teaches overthrow of the government by force and violence.

Two Judges, Miller and Prettyman, rejected this plea, relying on the *Rogers* case. But Chief Judge Edgerton dissented, citing Hoffman v. U. S. (341 U. S. 479) where the Supreme Court in a gangster case held that the privilege against self-incrimination protects a refusal to answer unless it is " '*perfectly clear,*' from a careful consideration of all the circumstances . . . that the answer . . . *cannot possibly* have such tendency to incriminate" (italics in original).

"Though the appellant," Judge Edgerton argued, "had attributed an innocent character to his group, it did not follow that the government would not be able, in a prosecution under the Smith Act, to convince a jury that his group was not what he said it was but actually advocated overthrow of the government by force. It did not follow that the government would not be able, in a prosecution for perjury, to convince a jury that he had given the Committee testimony which was false and which he knew to be false."

Casuistical Drivel

The *Singer* case is much like the *Watkins* case, except that Dr. Singer unlike the UAW organizer had invoked the Fifth as well as conscience to defend his refusal to inform. His chances in the Supreme Court therefore seem better than those of Watkins. Dr. Singer's victory would slightly enlarge the protections of the Fifth. There is also a chance, of course, that the Supreme Court might reverse the conviction on the ground that no real purpose was served by asking Dr. Singer to identify those nine others, since they were already known to the Committee as "hard core" Communists.

It is, of course, a commentary on our times that such casuistical drivel should be the last resort of decent people like Dr. Singer in their lonely struggle to maintain their self-respect and some freedom of political association.

*** For a full and lucid exposition of the defense theory we recommend the article published by Mr. Daniel H. Pollitt, Singer's chief defense counsel, in the Notre Dame Lawyer for December, 1956.**

Academic Celerity

Four years ago Horace B. Davis was dismissed as an economics professor by the University of Kansas City after invoking the Fifth before the Jenner committee. The American Association of University Professors has finally published a report on the case, containing no recommendations for censure but finding that "A refusal to answer questions about possible Communist affiliations is ill considered but, standing alone, it does not merit dismissal."

AWARE Alarmed by Report that Author of "High Noon" Did Not Name Names

Our readers will be pleased to hear that Godfrey P. Schmidt as head of AWARE, Inc., has sent an alarmed open letter to the House Un-American Activities Committee about Carl Foreman, the writer-producer of "High Noon" who has returned from exile in England to work again in Hollywood, on contract for Columbia Pictures. Foreman had been blacklisted since 1951 when he invoked the Fifth before the Committee. Mr. Schmidt objects that Columbia has sought to give the impression that Foreman was rehired because at a new hearing before the Committee he "has given names, dates and places," and been "cleared." It is a pleasure to record—on the high authority of Mr. Schmidt—that this does not seem to have been the case.

Mr. Schmidt claims that in reply to an inquiry from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Chairman Walter said there had been no "hearing" and it was "unfortunate" that a press release had created the impression that Foreman had been "cleared" as a "cooperative" witness. Mr. Schmidt says it is clear from this that Mr. Foreman was still an "uncooperative" witness. Mr. Schmidt protests that in not publicly challenging Mr. Foreman's return to respectability and employment, the Committee is setting "a standard far lower than, for instance, that applied to playwright Arthur Miller . . . and . . . to the three stage personalities . . . singer Pete Seeger and actors George Tyne and Elliott Sullivan" indicted for refusing to turn informer for the Committee.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One Calls That "Beast on the Prowl" Communism, The Other Capitalism

(*Continued from Page One*)

points out in a letter we reprint on page two) are of no good except for suicide. The White Paper says quite rightly that Britain's influence in the world "depends first and foremost on the health of her internal economy and the success of her export trade." But it then turns around and outlines a program which concentrates on the most expensive kind of weapons. Those who look at the gobbledygook in paragraph 72 of the White Paper, with its "neverthless it can safely be assumed that the new plan . . . when fully implemented . . . will further appreciably reduce the burden on the economy" will see the truth peeping out. There is no assurance here of any saving. England is cutting down on conventional arms but only so she can "keep up with the Joneses" of Russia and America in the nuclear race toward a nuclear war the British Isles certainly will not survive.

Labor's Divided Mind

Unfortunately in this juncture the Labor opposition does not speak with a clear and undivided voice. Labor wants to get rid of conscription and yet maintain a conventional army. It asks a temporary cessation of nuclear tests but wants to go on with the making of the H-bomb. The saddest if clearest voice seems to be that of R. H. S. Crossman. Two years ago he was an advocate of a British H-bomb to maintain independence of the U. S. He told the Commons he has now become convinced that the only defense policy for Britain was in concert with France and Germany "to renounce not only the great deterrent, but all nuclear weapons." But this is not the voice of the Labor Party, but of a peripheral figure.

Never was there greater need for a new lead and a new leadership. Two monstrous machines, one headed up in Washington, the other in Moscow, are moving toward a war neither wants but no one seems able to prevent. That warning of Dulles' last week against the "suicidal sovereignty" which would leave small nations at the mercy of That Beast "on the prowl" might as easily have been uttered by Krushchev. The only difference is that for one the Beast is Communism and for the other the Beast is capitalism. Our Secretary of State's warning to the neutrals is exactly like the warning Krushchev has been giving the dissident Hungarians and Polish Communists: "You cannot stand alone because That Beast is on the prowl." One preaches "interdependence" with Moscow, the other "interdependence" with Washington. Each side is willing to liberate the other's satellites, but not its own. Each side is self-righteous about the other's bases, one in Eastern Europe, the other in the Middle East. They have so long gazed at each other with hate that they have begun to look alike, like a long wedded pair, in the surest wedding of all, that of hatred.

Both sides need to be liberated from each other. Mutual terror can only end in mutual destruction. The refugee Mayor of Budapest said here a few weeks ago in a speech to which little attention was paid, "We don't want arms. We want diplomacy." The path to liberation is mutual withdrawal. The new Russian feeler for putting an end to the occupation of Europe by mutual agreement as suggested in the past by Eden and later by Gaitskill could be the beginning of a fruitful diplomacy. But Washington is still in the grip of the dream that if cold war and trade embargo and the pressures of the arms race are kept up long enough, it can get a kind of unconditional surrender by the Russians without war. This is the will of the wisp which draws us toward the final brink.

Unhappy Men Debate Their Unhappy Fate

MR. GEORGE THOMAS (Cardiff, West, Lab.) said . . . the hydrogen bomb was an evil thing . . . an offense against God and man . . . spreading its death and worse over neutral lands as well as belligerents . . . its malignant curse. There was enough [radioactive] dust in the upper atmosphere to ensure that 30,000 people would be born either sterile, or idiots, or with cancer of the bone. What cowardice it was to say in the name of defense that Britain was willing to risk the well being of unborn generations.

MAJOR BEAMISH (Lewes, C.) said that no one would deny that the hydrogen bomb was evil, but the terrible thing was that it was in the hands of evil people. (Opposition cries of dissent). One had only to recall what had happened recently in Hungary to know how evil were the hands it was in. (Opposition cries of "Suez!" and "Nagasaki!").

—*Debate on the White Paper, House of Commons, April 17.*

Send for Extra Copies of This Issue to Give Out to Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....
4/20/57

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED